

Remarks

In response to the rejection of claims 1, 2, 10, 11 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a), Applicants have herein:


1. Amended claim 1 to incorporate the material limitations of claim 3, cancelled claim 3, and amended claim 4 to depend from claim 1. According, Applicants respectfully allowance of claim 1, as amended, and claims 2 and 4-9 depending therefrom.
2. Amended claim 10 to incorporate the material limitations of claim 12, cancelled claim 12, and amended claim 13 to depend from claim 10. According, Applicants respectfully allowance of claim 10, as amended, and claims 11 and 13-18 depending therefrom.
3. Amended claims 19 and 20 to incorporate the substantially similar limitations to those set forth in claim 3. According, Applicants respectfully allowance of claims 19 and 20, as amended.

In response to the rejection of claims 21, 22 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a), Applicants would once again point out to the Examiner that there is no teaching or suggestion in either Landfield or Dutta that the firewall host system 28 can "selectively [transfer] to the [firewall host system 26] at least a portion of the received [email] even if the protection rule allows transfer of the received [email]" (claim 21, lines 16-19; claim 22, lines 9-11; claim 23, lines 10-12). In all three claims, the direction of transfer is opposite to that used to download the protection rule set -- such functionality cannot be found in either Landfield or Dutta. Further, assuming *arguendo* that such functionality was either taught or suggested in Landfield and/or Dutta, Applicants can find no teaching or suggestion in either Landfield or Dutta that the firewall host system 26 is capable of "selectively creating ... a second [alias] in response to [the portion of the email that we have assumed was sent by firewall host system 28]" (claim 23, lines 13-14). According, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 21, 22 and 23 is improper.

Conclusion:

Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments proposed hereinabove. In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-2, 4-11 and 13-23, as may be amended herein, are all allowable over the cited art. Therefore, in the belief that we have responded to each and every rejection contained in the Office Action of 3 November 2005, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-2, 4-11 and 13-23.

Respectfully submitted,
Stuart D. Green, *et al.*


Jeffrey Van Myers
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 27,362
Ph: 512.858.7453